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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Editor and reviewer’s comments:

Editor Comments

Thank you for your revised submission to BMC Nursing.

Before we can accept your manuscript, please address the following editorial points in addition to the reviewer’s comments below:

We thank the Editor for the valuable comments in improving the manuscript. Kindly find the point-by-point response along with description of the amendments:

1. Please clarify whether the questionnaire was changed from the published version. If it was translated or changed, please include it as supplementary material.

Response: The questionnaire was neither changed nor translated while administering to the students. The table-2 has 38-items of the questionnaire (in the same order) that was included for the final analysis. The two-items that were not included in the analysis were also described in page 11 under “Internal consistency” para. Hence including the questionnaire as supplementary material will be...
2. We have noticed there is a significant amount of text overlap between your manuscript and previously published papers. Please edit the text throughout to reduce the similarity with these papers. We realize that some overlap is unavoidable, especially in the Methods and descriptions of the standard instrument, but please ensure that the manuscript is written in your own words as much as is possible, even when citing.

Response: Thanks for the comment. We now have edited or paraphrased the text wherever possible in the manuscript to reduce the similarity with previously published papers. With this we believe that the manuscript is written in our own words as much as is possible, even when citing.

The following are the descriptions of the amendment where we have edited or paraphrased the text:

Background section, lines 3, 4, 5,6 & 7, para 1, page 4
Background section, lines 14, 15, 16, & 21, para 2 page 4
Background section, lines 12 & 16, para 4 page 5
Data collection section, lines 19 & 21, page 7
Study instrument section, lines 9-14, para 1 page 8
Study instrument section, lines 15,16 & 23, para 2 page 8
Study instrument section, line 1, para 2 page 9
Study instrument section, lines 9,10 & 16, para 3 page 9
Discussion section, lines 7 &8, page 13
Discussion section, lines 23, page 14
Implications for Nursing Care section, lines 12-15,17-19, page 15
Implications for Nursing Curriculum section, line 25, para 2, page 16
Implications for Nursing Curriculum section, line 1-2, para 2, page 17
Implications for Nursing Curriculum section, lines 11, 12 &15, para 3, page 17
Implications for Nursing Curriculum section, lines 20-23, para 4, page 17
Implications for Nursing Curriculum section, lines 1-2, para 4, page 18
Global relevance for nursing curriculum and care section, lines 9 &10, page 18
Conclusion section, line 1, page 20

Reviewer Reports

Ingrid Poulsen, PhD. (Reviewer 1)

1. Dear authors, thank you for the revisions of your paper, which I find very good and carefully conducted. Please look through the abstract to see if anything should be revised in order to match the main paper, e.g. to mention what kind of misconceptions this is about.

Response: We are glad that we have addressed the suggestions appropriately. We now have mentioned the kind of misconceptions that we are referring in Abstract Section, Line 5-7, page 2.

2. I have few comments. You have explained about the young age of nursing students, and that is fine. However, how can you say that the nurse’s students participating were senior, when a few were 17 and 18 years? These participants cannot have been senior.
Response: In our setting, undergraduate nursing students other than 1 year as usually labelled as senior nursing students. However, we fully agree that in the global context this may not be an appropriate and standardized term. Hence to avoid confusion and ambiguity, we now have removed the term “senior” in our title and manuscript. This will not change either the content, context or the implications of our manuscript.

The following are the descriptions of the amendment where we have deleted the text “senior” from the manuscript:
Title, Line 1, page 1
Abstract section, line 14, page 2
Abstract section, line 19, page 2
Abstract section, line 3, page 3
Aim section, line 11 & 12, page 6
Methods section, lines 15,16 & 22, page 6
Data collection, line 16, page 7
Implications for Nursing Care section, line 3 & 7, page 16

3. If you translated the questionnaire into local language and if yes, how was this done? if not, did the nursing students have any troubles with the English language?

Response: As the medium of instruction for undergraduate nursing curriculum is English in our country, the questionnaire was not translated in local language. As such, the nursing students did not have any trouble with the English language.